#99

(b)(3) 10.U.S.C 424;(b)(6)			
From: Sent: To: Subject:	Wednesda (b)(3) 10.U.S	(b)(3) 10.U.S.C 424;(b)(6) Wednesday, May 17, 2017 2:18 PM (b)(3) 10.U.S.C 424;(b)(6) [From NIPRNet] FW: [Non-DoD Source] Status report: Holbrook Memoir, DIA 16-119		
From: James Holbre Sent: Monday, May To: (b)(3) 10.U.S.C Cc: (b)(3) 10.U.S.C	ook (b)(6) 7 15, 2017 9:44 AM 424;(b)(6)			(b)(6)
		ilbrook Memoir, DIA 16-119		
15 May 2017				
(b)(3) 10.U.S.C 424;(k)(6)			
		ompleted. I await only answe e discussions of our 27 April r		u earlier. I canno
(b)(6)	vill be making arrangemer	nts with you today to come to	DIA with the hardcopy of w	hat I call my "CIA
Rewrite." It is base	d on the April redactions. with this issue. (b)(6) o (b)(6) before he reti	Lunderstand that (b)(6)	was the reviewer pres	ent at our rewrite so they
		ewers to delete references to		

Although we discussed the tendency for reviewers to delete references to the fact that you sent me old IRs that DIA declassified and returned to me at my request, in my latest rewrite of the entire manuscript I found many, many instances where this was done and those references were redacted. Those redactions are frustrating and clearly contain nothing requiring national security protection. I need those references to add authenticity to my story. In my "Sources" I state DIA sent me those reports. I believe we agreed at our meeting that it was ok to keep them in. If those references were redacted because the reviewer thought they might reflect badly on DIA, I remind you that your Prepublication Review Policy paragraph 3.4 states: "Information will not be denied release because its public disclosure may reveal administrative error or inefficiency."

As you stated after our meeting, we need to get the attache story out. Attaches are a very important element of DIA. But we must be sure we are telling a true story.

Jim Holbrook